

* * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *

NUMBER:	Not Applicable
CASES:	

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: Not Applicable Member: Siranosian, Veronica Thomas Guide: 557-560 and 586-590 USGS Quad: Thousand Oaks, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Malibu Beach, Point Dume, Topanga	4100									
	41									
	41									
Parcels scattered throughout the unincorporated area of the Santa Monica Mountains west of the										
City of Los Angeles and north of the Coastal Zone boundary, with concentrations along										
Mulhalland Highway at the intersections with Cornell Road Troutdale Drive and Cornell										
Location: School Road; Topanga Canyon Boulevard between Santa Maria Road and Cheney Drive; the	_									
intersection of Las Virgenes Road and Brittany Court; the intersection of Agoura Road and										
Liberty Canyon Road; and north of the Ventura Freeway (US-101) west of Parkway Calabasa										
Description of Project: An amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community										
Standards District allowing local-serving business uses, buildings, and structures that were lawfully esta-										
blished and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to the adoption of the zone change	S									
associated with implementation of the North Area Plan, which became nonconforming as a result of the										
adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue in a conforming status as long as the use does not change										
The provision specifies that approval of a conditional use permit is required for expansion of the business that requires a building permit.										
Gross Acres: 209										
Environmental										
Setting: The topography of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment consists										
mainly of relatively flat lands, with some rolling and moderately steep hills. No perennial streams run										
through the parcels potentially affected by the amendment.										
Zoning: <i>R-1, A-1, O-S, R-R</i>										
General										
Plan: Non-urban, Open Space, Rural Communities										
Community/Area wide										
Plan: OS, OS-P, OS-DR, N20, N10, N5, N2, N1										

1

2/26/07

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER DI	ESCRIPTION & STATUS	
Not Applicable		
NOTE E EID I		
NOTE: For EIRs, above projec	ts are not sufficient for cumulative an	alysis.
	REVIEWING AGENCIES	
	<u>ILL VIL VI VO TIOLI VOILD</u>	
Responsible Agencies	Special Reviewing Agencies	Regional Significance
None	✓ None	None
☐ Regional Water Quality	✓ Santa Monica Mountains	
Control Board	Conservancy	☑ SCAG Criteria
✓ Los Angeles Region	National Parks	☐ Air Quality
Lahontan Region	National Forest	Water Resources
Coastal Commission	Edwards Air Force Base	☑ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
Coastai Commission	Resource Conservation	E ganta Womea Withs. Area
Army Corps of Engineers	District of Santa Monica Mtns.	
	Area	
☑ CA Dept. of		
Transportation	☑ City of Agoura Hills	
	☑ City of Calabasas	
	☑ City of Hidden Hills	
	☑ City of Los Angeles	
	☑ City of Malibu	
	☑ City of Westlake Village	
Trustee Agencies	☑ County of Ventura	County Reviewing Agencies
	☑ California State University,	
✓ None	Fullerton	☐ Subdivision Committee
State Fish and Game		☐ DPW:
State Parks		

2/26/07

IMPACT ANALYS	ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)								
			Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Informatio Requiring Preparation of an EIR						
			New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Effect						
						New	Information Showing Greater Significant Effect		
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg					Change Requiring Major EIR Revisions		
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$] [
	2. Flood	6	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
	3. Fire	7	$\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$]				
	4. Noise	8	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$						
	2. Air Quality	10	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$] [
	3. Biota	11	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
	4. Cultural Resources	12	V]				
	5. Mineral Resources	13	\square]				
	6. Agriculture Resources	14] [
	7. Visual Qualities	15	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$						
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	\square						
	3. Education	18	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	\square						
	5. Utilities	20	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$] [
OTHER	1. General	21	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$]				
	2. Environmental	22	V		ı İ				
	Safety				,	_			
	3. Land Use	23]	Ш			
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	V						
	5. Mandatory Findings	25							
	MONITORING SYSTEM (
_							ll be employed in the Initial Study phase of		
	review procedure as pres	cribe	d by s	state	e l	aw.			
Development 1 1. Designation:	• •	A nnli.	cablo	onl	. , :	to in	ndividual development projects.		
	Is the project located i						ey, East San Gabriel Valley,		
2. ☑ Yes ☐ No	Malibu/Santa Monica	Mou	ntain	s or	·S	anta	a Clarita Valley planning area?		
3. ☐ Yes ☑ No	amendment to, an urb	an ex	pans	ion	de	esigi			
^	uestions are answered "yes", t printout generated (attacl	•	ject is	sub	je	ct to	a County DMS analysis.		
Date of	<u>-</u>								
printout:									
—	overview worksheet comp		`				_		
EIRs and/or staff i	reports shall utilize the mo	st cu	rrent	DN	1S	inf	ormation available.		

Env	ironmental Finding:
FIN	AL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:
$\overline{\checkmark}$	ADDENDUM TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project is a minor technical change or addition to the adopted Community Standards District.
	An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that none of the conditions described in CEQA Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration exist.
	NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
	An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.
	MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).
	An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.
	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".
	☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal

Approved by: Gina M. Natoli Date:

standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact				
<u>a.</u>	Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?						•				
b.	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?										
c.	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?										
d.	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?					•					
e.	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?						•				
f.	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?										
g.	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?						•				
DISCUSSION											
The topography of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment consists mainly of relatively flat lands, with some rolling and moderately steep hills. Some of the parcels potentially affected are in landslide or liquefaction zones. No fault traces cross the subject parcels and no parcels are located in seismic zones.											
СО	CONCLUSION										
	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis										

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

New

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact		
a.	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?					•			
b.	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?								
C.	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?								
d.	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?								
e.	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?								
f.	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?								
DIS	SCUSSION								
<u>A f</u>	A few of the subject parcels contain major drainage courses. A few of the subject parcels contain 100-year floodplains.								
CO	CONCLUSION								
	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis								

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact			
<u>a.</u> b.	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?									
D.	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?					•				
C.	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?									
d.	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?									
e.	Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?									
f.	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?									
g.	Other factors?									
DISCUSSION										
<u>All</u>	All of the parcels potentially affected by the amendment are located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.									
СО	CONCLUSION									
	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis									

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

New

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact			
<u>a.</u>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?					•				
b.	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?									
C.	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?						•			
d.	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?									
е.	Other factors?									
DIS	SCUSSION									
<u>So</u>	Some of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment are near the Ventura Freeway (US-101).									
CC	CONCLUSION									
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR		Addendum E	IR/ND	☐ No Additional Analysis					

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact					
Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposita. the use of individual water wells?						•					
Will the proposed project require the use of b. private sewage disposal system?	of a										
If the answer is yes, is the project site loca an area having known septic tank limitatio due to high groundwater or other geotechr limitations or is the project proposing on-si systems located in close proximity to a dracourse?	ns nical ite \Box				•						
Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or c. receiving water bodies?											
Could the project's post-development active potentially degrade the quality of storm was runoff and/or could post-development non-water discharges contribute potential polluto the storm water conveyance system and receiving bodies?	iter -storm tants					•					
e. Other factors?											
DISCUSSION											
The subject parcels may use onsite wastewater treatment systems. A few of these parcels are located in close proximity to drainage courses.											
CONCLUSION											
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis										

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact	
а.	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?						•	
b.	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?							
C.	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?						•	
d.	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?							
е	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?							
f.	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?							
g. 	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?						•	
h.	Other factors?							
DIS	SCUSSION							
The	The proposed amendment does not authorize new development in an area where it was not previously allowed.							
CO	NCLUSION							
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR		Additional A	Analysis				

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS		Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact			
Is the project site located within a S Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer Sensitive Environmental Resource etc.), or is the site relatively undistua. a. natural?	, or coastal (ESHA,					•				
Will grading, fire clearance, or floor improvements remove substantial ib. habitat areas?	natural									
Is a major drainage course, as ider USGS quad sheets by a blue, dash c. located on the project site?										
Does the project site contain a major other sensitive habitat (e.g., coasta oak woodland, sycamore riparian w.d. wetland, etc.)?	l sage scrub,									
Does the project site contain oak o unique native trees (specify kinds of	f trees)?									
Is the project site habitat for any kn sensitive species (federal or state I f. endangered, etc.)?										
Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor g. open space linkage)?	adjacent									
g. open space linkage)? The subject parcels contain portions of SEA Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12. No construction is proposed as part of the project. The subject parcels contain many waterways throughout portions of the Malibu Creek watershed. The parcels also contain Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest, Southern Riparian Forest, Valley Needlegrass Grassland, and Valley Oak Woodland Other native trees on the parcels are Coast live oak, valley oak, western sycamore, southern California black walnut, and California juniper. The project site is a habitat for southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, pallid bat, golden eagle, coastal western whiptail, Braunton's milk-vetch, burrowing owl, round-leaved flaree, slender mariposa lily, Plummer's mariposa lily, monarch butterfly, San Bernardino ringneck snake, Agoura Hills dudleya, Santa Monica Mountains dudleya, southwestern pond turtle, spotted bat, western mastiff bat, California mountain kingsnake, San Diego desert woodrat, Lyon's pentachaeta, Coast horned lizard, coastal California gnatcatcher, two-striped garter snake, Sonoran maiden fern, and Santa Monica grasshopper. The subject parcels are also part of the Liberty Canyon wildlife corridor. CONCLUSION Addendum EIR/ND No Additional Analysis MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS										
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Oak Tree Permit ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review										

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact					
Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate a. potential archaeological sensitivity?					•						
Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential b. paleontological resources?											
c. Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?											
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as d. defined in 15064.5?						•					
Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource e. or site or unique geologic feature?						•					
f. Other factors?											
Natural features that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity are found on some of the subject parcels. There is an indication of potential paleontological resources due to geologic features on some of the subject parcels. None of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment are registered as historic-cultural monuments.											
CONCLUSION ☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis											

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

New

NOT APPLICABLE

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact				
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the a. residents of the state?										
Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use b. plan?										
c Other factors?										
DISCUSSION There are no known mineral resources affected by the project. CONCLUSION										
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	☐ Addend	dum EIR/ND		No Ado	litional Analy	/sis				

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact				
Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California a. Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?										
Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act b. contract?										
Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of c. Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	- 									
d. Other factors?										
DISCUSSION None of the subject parcels contain or border prime or unique farmland and none is designated as being of statewide or local importance. CONCLUSION										
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	☐ Adder	ndum EIR/ND		No Add	litional Analy	sis .				

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

s	ETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a	will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?					•	
b	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?						
C.	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features?						
d	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?						
е	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?						
f.	Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration)						
D	ISCUSSION						
<u>H</u> S th	Several parcels potentially affected by the amendment lighway. A few of the parcels are visible from sec Saddleback Trail (proposed), and the Calabasas-Colo neir boundaries. None of the subject properties conta in the subject properties are not out of character with roblems.	gments of th d Creek Trail in unique ae	e Topanga-He (proposed). A sthetic features	enry Ridge T few parcels a. A 35-foot h	rail (propos have propo neight limit w	sed), Backb sed trail rou vill ensure tha	one Trail, tes withir at projects
С	ONCLUSION						
	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR		Addendum E	EIR/ND	☐ No	Additional A	nalysis

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impaci			
a.	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?						•			
b.	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?									
C.	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?									
d.	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?									
e.	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?						•			
f.	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?									
g.	Other factors? Change of primary access	. 🗆								
The exp hig ger	DISCUSSION The amendment will allow expansion of the subject businesses, potentially contributing to traffic/access problems. Such expansions will require approval of a conditional use permit to ensure that the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate. CONCLUSION									
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	Adder	ndum EIR/ND		□No Add	litional Anal	ysis			

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the a. treatment plant?						
Could the project create capacity problems in b. the sewer lines serving the project site?						
c. Other factors?						
DISCUSSION Some of the subject parcels will be on sewers. The assewage disposal systems. Any such expansion will reproposed site is served by public or private service factorical conclusion.	equire appro	oval of a condit			-	<u>' impact</u>
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	Adde	ndum EIR/ND		□No Add	litional Analy	/sis

SERVICES - 3. Education

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact				
a.	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?										
b.	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?										
C.	Could the project create student transportation problems?										
d.	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?										
e.	Other factors?										
The pop	DISCUSSION The amendment is concerned with local-serving businesses, and does not impact school enrollment or increase population. CONCLUSION										
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis											

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

New

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a.	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?						
b.	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?					•	
C.	Other factors?						
Th of t pul Ve	SCUSSION The project does not increase the number of possible The land, building, or structure will require a condict of the land, building, and general welfare. The parcent of the paragraph of the paragraph of the land	tional use pe	rmit to ensure t	hat such cha	nges do not	<u>jeopardize</u>	_
CO	NCLUSION						
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	Adden	dum EIR/ND			ditional Analy	vsis

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a.	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?						•
b.	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?						
C.	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?						
d.	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?						
e.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?						•
f.	Other factors?						
DIS	SCUSSION						
СО	NCLUSION						
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional An					sis .

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

New

SE	ETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact				
а	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?										
b	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?										
С	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?										
d	Other factors?										
<u>Th</u> <u>en</u> us	DISCUSSION The project does not increase the number of local-serving businesses and requires that any extension, expansions, or enlargement of the land, building, or structure is consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan and that the use is local-serving and consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan. CONCLUSION										
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis							/sis				

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety Information New Showing Less Than Information Ability to Significant Reduce, Impact/No Showing Substantial Substantial Greater but Not Changes or Change in Change in Significant Eliminate New Circumstances Effects Significant Information Project Effects in Requiring Requiring than Requiring Major EIR Major EIR Previous Previous Preparation No **SETTING/IMPACTS** EIR(s) Revisions Revisions EIR(s) of an EIR Impact Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-П П П site? a. Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any П П hazardous wastes stored on-site? b. Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially П П adversely affected? C. Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? d. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the П accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency П П П response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Other factors? П

DISCUSSION

The amendment allows local-serving businesses to continue and expand. Some of these businesses may involve hazardous materials.

CONCLUSION

	☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR		dum EIR/ND	☐ No Additional Analysis						
		OTHER F	ACTORS - <u>3. l</u>	_and Use						
SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact			
a.	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?									
b.	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?									
C.	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:									
	Hillside Management Criteria?									
	SEA Conformance Criteria?									
	Other?									
d.	Would the project physically divide an established community?									
e.	Other factors?									
The Ord ma	DISCUSSION The amendment is being proposed because some uses were inadvertently made inconsistent with the implementation of Ordinance 2002-0062Z. The allowable local-serving businesses are consistent with the Plan's land use policy map. CONCLUSION									
	Subsequent/Supplemental EIR	Adder	ndum EIR/ND		☐No Additional Analysis					

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact					
a.	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?						•					
b.	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?						•					
C.	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?											
d.	Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?					•						
e.	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?											
f.	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?						•					
g.	Other factors?											
The bus Thi pos an inci	DISCUSSION The project includes the potential expansion of use, building, or structure, which could affect employment. Local-serving businesses were already considered in the Neg. Dec. to the CSD, and were found to have a less than significant impact. This amendment will not allow any uses more intense than what was previously allowed or any increase in the number of possible businesses, so there is no change or new information regarding employment that would require preparation of an EIR. Since the project will allow service providers to be closer to customers, VMT would likely decrease rather than increase. CONCLUSION											
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR												

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

SE	TTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
а.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Does the project have possible environmental						
b.	effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.						•
C.	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?						
DISCUSSION The project does not allow new uses on previously-vacant land. CONCLUSION							
☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR		☐ Addendum EIR/ND			No Additional Analysis		